

<sup>25</sup>  
~~58.~~ (New) The electronic still camera of claim <sup>15</sup>~~42~~ wherein the first color pattern includes substantially one-half green color filters.

<sup>26</sup>  
~~59.~~ (New) The electronic still camera of claim <sup>35</sup>~~38~~ wherein the color display pixels are arranged in a pattern having substantially one-third green color filters.

<sup>27</sup>  
~~60.~~ (New) The electronic still camera of claim <sup>15</sup>~~42~~ wherein the first color pattern is a Bayer checkerboard pattern.

<sup>28</sup>  
~~61.~~ (New) The electronic still camera of claim <sup>15</sup>~~42~~ wherein the distance between adjacent image sensor photosites in the horizontal direction are substantially equal to the distance between the adjacent image sensor photosites in the vertical direction, and wherein the distance between the adjacent color display pixels in the horizontal direction is different than the distance between the adjacent color display pixels in the vertical direction.

### REMARKS

Claims 52-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

By this amendment, claims 52 and 53 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 52 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is believed to be moot.

Claims 32-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pape (U.S. Patent No. 4,819,059) in view of Ueda (U.S. Patent No. 5,923,816), further in view of Parulski (U.S. Patent No. 4,876,590).

By this amendment, independent claims 32 and 42 have been changed to more clearly set forth the present invention. As amended, claims 32 and 42 particularly point out that the electronic still camera includes an image

F3  
concl

34

F

sensor having a two-dimensional array of photosites covered by a mosaic pattern of color filters including at least three different colors for capturing images of a scene, with each captured image having a first number of color pixel values provided in a first color pattern. The electronic still camera also includes motion processing means (a motion processor in amended claim 42) for generating from the captured images, a second number of color pixel values provided in a second color pattern having at least three different colors and representative of a series of motion images to be previewed, with the second number of color pixel values being less than the first number of color pixel values, and the second color pattern being different from the first color pattern. The electronic still camera further includes still processing means (a still processor in amended claim 42) for generating a third number of color pixel values including at least three different colors representative of a processed captured still image.

Pape, Ueda and Parulski, both singly and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the electronic still camera as set forth in amended claims 32 and 42. Pape is directed to a system for formatting and deformatting moving image defining electronic information signals interspersed with still image defining electronic information signals. The system of Pape includes decimator circuits 28R, 28G, and 28B, and undecimator circuits 54R, 54G, and 54B. The decimator circuits operate on the still image to divide the high resolution still image into a number of low resolution images for recording on a standard video formatted recorder as multiple field images. On video playback, these multiple field signals are provided to the undecimator circuits to reformat the signal to recover the original high resolution still image. In contrast, the processing of the electronic camera set forth in amended claims 32 and 42 operates on the motion images.

In addition, the decimator and undecimator circuits of Pape do not modify the color pattern of the image as set forth in amended claims 32 and 42. Rather, the decimator circuits reduce by an equal amount, the number of red, green and blue pixels from the still image used in each recorded video field to obtain the motion images for recording. Similarly, the undecimator circuits

F

increase by an equal amount, the number of red, green and blue pixels from the recorded video fields to provide the high resolution still image at playback. The combination of decimation for recording and undecimation for playback as taught by Pape results in an unmodified image.

In contrast, the motion processing means and motion processor, as set forth in amended claims 32 and 42, respectively, produce a modified digital image with fewer pixels in a different color pattern which can then be provided to a color display having a color pattern different from the color pattern used by the image sensor. This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested in Pape.

Further, the Examiner has acknowledged that Pape fails to disclose or suggest that a still image is captured while previewing the motion images, but relies on the Ueda reference for providing such teachings. In addition, the Examiner has acknowledged that Pape and Ueda fail to disclose the motion processing as set forth in amended claims 32 and 42 where the second number of color pixel values is less than the first number (image sensor number), the second color pattern is different from the first color pattern, and the different display pattern. The Examiner cites the Parulski reference as providing such teachings and states that Parulski discloses a video camera with a low resolution display for displaying NTSC video images where the motion signals are generated from a portion (luminance only, second number and second color pattern) of the high resolution image output, with the display being a monochrome monitor.

As the Examiner has acknowledged, Ueda (as well as Pape in combination therewith) does not teach or suggest any processing which modifies the color pattern of the color pixel values provided by an image sensor to provide a different color pattern or a different number of color pixel values, as set forth in amended claims 32 and 42. Moreover, Applicants believe that the Parulski reference fails to teach the features set forth in amended claims 32 and 42.

Parulski is directed to an imaging apparatus for generating a lower resolution verification image signal for a higher resolution image source. As the Examiner points out, the Parulski apparatus includes a monochrome monitor for displaying a low-resolution image which is generated from all or a portion of the

F

luminance signals from the lines of same-color luminance filter elements. More specifically, the Parulski apparatus converts a red, green and blue color mosaic pattern into a green only pattern in order to provide a luminance signal. The Parulski apparatus thus does not modify the color pattern of all three colors of the color pixel values as set forth in amended claims 32 and 42.

The combination of Pape, Ueda and Parulski does not teach or suggest the electronic still camera of the present invention which operates on the motion images and which modifies the color pattern of all three colors of the color pixel values provided by an image sensor to provide a different color pattern or a different number of color pixel values. Furthermore, there is no motivation to combine Parulski and Ueda with Pape to arrive at the present invention, particularly since the processing taught by Pape does not operate on the motion images, Ueda does not provide any disclosure or suggestion at all regarding a color image sensor or a color display, and Parulski does not teach or suggest modifying the pattern of all three colors of the color pixel values of the captured image. Moreover, even assuming that the references could be combined, the electronic still camera set forth in amended claims 32 and 42 would still not be disclosed or suggested. Accordingly, amended claims 32 and 42 are believed to define unobvious subject matter over the combined teachings of the Pape, Ueda and Parulski references, and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is requested.

Dependent claims 33-41 and 43-51 depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are believed to be patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above. In addition, new claims 54-57 and 58-61 have been added which depend on amended claims 32 and 42, respectively. New claims 54-61 are believed to be patentable due at least to their depending on amended claims 32 and 42.

Claims 52 and 53 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 52 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is believed to be moot.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this

F

application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call to discuss any such remaining issues in order to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela R. Crocker

Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 42,447

Pamela R. Crocker/phw  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: (716) 477-0553  
Facsimile: (716) 477-4646

F